



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/662,337	09/16/2003	Keiko Shiraishi	117194	9255
25944	7590	01/24/2007	EXAMINER	
OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC P.O. BOX 19928 ALEXANDRIA, VA 22320			PATEL, MANGLESH M	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2178	
SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE		
3 MONTHS	01/24/2007	PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/662,337	SHIRASHI ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit		
Manglesh M. Patel	2178		

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 30 October 2006.

2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-17 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1-17 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application

6) Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. This Non-Final action is responsive to the RCE filed on October 30, 2006.
2. Claims 1-17 are pending. Claims 1, 10, 11, 12, 13, 16 and 17 are independent claims.

Withdrawn Rejections

3. The 35 U.S.C. 103(a) rejections of claims 1-10 & 13-16 with cited references of Lee U.S. 6,208,427 in view of Matsushita U.S. 6,813,036 have been withdrawn in light of the amendment and newly cited art.
4. The 35 U.S.C. 103(a) rejection of claims 11 & 12 with cited references of Kadokawa U.S. 6,674,537 in view of Lee U.S. 6,208,427 further in view of Matsushita U.S. 6,813,036 have been withdrawn in light of the amendment and newly cited art.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 1-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Joshi (U.S. 7,134,137, filed Feb 26, 2001) in view of Layman (U.S. 7,069,335, filed Aug 9, 2000).

Regarding Independent claims 1, 10, 13 and 16, Joshi teaches An instruction form retrieval apparatus comprising: A storage part that stores user information and information on an instruction form management apparatus that is connected to the instruction form retrieval apparatus via a network and is holding an instruction form accessible to a user, the instruction form and the user information, being associated with each other (column 2, lines 45-67 & column 48, lines 18-21, Joshi teaches the use of identity information from an identity profile in a system that provides data to resources on a network. Further Joshi indicates that the system uses XML language instructions in a remote procedure call. The XML data is the instruction form and is associated with the identity profile). A reception part that receives information on a user (column 17, lines 20-30, wherein the auditing module and audit logs make up the reception part that receives information on the user); A retrieval part that retrieves the instruction form accessible to the user from the instruction form management apparatus based on the received information on the user (column 2, lines 45-67 & column 48, lines 18-21, wherein the user profile information allows access to the instruction form as described by the XML

instructions defined in the remote procedure call. Further a remote procedure call allows instructions to be sent across different computers that follow the instructions to perform tasks or run other applications); Although Joshi mentions the use of remote procedure calls and user authorization he fails to describe the actual execution of the instruction form. Layman discloses An output part that outputs information on the retrieved instruction form to allow the user to instruct performing a process indicated in the instruction form to one or more instruction form execution apparatuses connected to the instruction form retrieval apparatus via the network. (abstract, fig 2 & 3, & column 5, lines 20-60, wherein the instruction form is the XML message that includes instructions to be performed by another computer on the network using a remote procedure call). At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to output the instructions on the form to an execution apparatus on the network. The motivation being that Joshi indicates that the invention uses remote procedure calls using XML but not in detail whereas Layman describes in detail the execution of instructions to an apparatus on the network using XML based remote procedure calls or SOAP for exchanging messages.

Regarding Dependent claim 2, with dependency of claim 1, Joshi teaches the use of identity information from an identity profile in a system that provides data to resources on a network. Further Joshi indicates that the system uses XML language instructions in a remote procedure call. The XML data is the instruction form and is associated with the identity profile (column 2, lines 45-67 & column 48, lines 18-21). Although Joshi mentions the use of remote procedure calls and user authorization he fails to describe the actual execution of the instruction form. Layman discloses wherein the output part outputs the information on the retrieved instruction form to the instruction form execution apparatus used by the user (abstract, fig 2 & 3, & column 5, lines 20-60). At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to output the instructions on the form to an execution apparatus on the network. The motivation being that Joshi indicates that the invention uses remote procedure calls using XML but not in detail whereas Layman describes in detail the execution of instructions to an apparatus on the network using XML based remote procedure calls or SOAP for exchanging messages.

Regarding Dependent claim 3, with dependency of claim 1, Joshi teaches the use of identity information from an identity profile in a system that provides data to resources on a network. Further Joshi indicates that the system uses XML language instructions in a remote procedure call. The XML data is the instruction form and is associated with the identity profile (column 2, lines 45-67 & column 48, lines 18-21). Although Joshi mentions the use of remote procedure calls and user authorization he fails to describe the actual execution of the instruction form. Layman

discloses wherein the output part outputs the information on the instruction form to a terminal used by the user (abstract, fig 2 & 3, & column 5, lines 20-60). At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to output the instructions on the form to an execution apparatus on the network. The motivation being that Joshi indicates that the invention uses remote procedure calls using XML but not in detail whereas Layman describes in detail the execution of instructions to an apparatus on the network using XML based remote procedure calls or SOAP for exchanging messages.

Regarding Dependent claim 4, with dependency of claim 1, Joshi teaches the use of identity information from an identity profile in a system that provides data to resources on a network. Further Joshi indicates that the system uses XML language instructions in a remote procedure call. The XML data is the instruction form and is associated with the identity profile (column 2, lines 45-67 & column 48, lines 18-21). Although Joshi mentions the use of remote procedure calls and user authorization he fails to describe the actual execution of the instruction form. Layman discloses wherein the output part outputs a command to the instruction form management apparatus to transmit the instruction form accessible to the user to the instruction form execution apparatus used by the user, based on the information on the retrieved instruction form (abstract, fig 2 & 3, & column 5, lines 20-60). At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to output the instructions on the form to an execution apparatus on the network. The motivation being that Joshi indicates that the invention uses remote procedure calls using XML but not in detail whereas Layman describes in detail the execution of instructions to an apparatus on the network using XML based remote procedure calls or SOAP for exchanging messages.

Regarding Dependent claim 5, with dependency of claim 1, Joshi teaches the use of identity information from an identity profile in a system that provides data to resources on a network. Further Joshi indicates that the system uses XML language instructions in a remote procedure call. The XML data is the instruction form and is associated with the identity profile (column 2, lines 45-67 & column 48, lines 18-21). Although Joshi mentions the use of remote procedure calls and user authorization he fails to describe the actual execution of the instruction form. Layman discloses wherein the output part outputs a command to the instruction form management apparatus to transmit the instruction form accessible to the user to a terminal used by the user, based on the information on the retrieved instruction form (abstract, fig 2 & 3, & column 5, lines 20-60). At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to output the instructions on the form to an execution apparatus on the network. The motivation being that Joshi indicates that the invention uses remote procedure calls using XML but not in detail

whereas Layman describes in detail the execution of instructions to an apparatus on the network using XML based remote procedure calls or SOAP for exchanging messages.

Regarding Dependent claim 6, with dependency of claim 1, Joshi teaches the use of identity information from an identity profile in a system that provides data to resources on a network. Further Joshi indicates that the system uses XML language instructions in a remote procedure call. The XML data is the instruction form and is associated with the identity profile (column 2, lines 45-67 & column 48, lines 18-21). Although Joshi mentions the use of remote procedure calls and user authorization he fails to describe the actual execution of the instruction form. Layman discloses wherein the outputted information on the retrieved instruction form is information on the instruction form management apparatus holding the instruction form (abstract, fig 2 &3, & column 5, lines 20-60). At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to output the instructions on the form to an execution apparatus on the network. The motivation being that Joshi indicates that the invention uses remote procedure calls using XML but not in detail whereas Layman describes in detail the execution of instructions to an apparatus on the network using XML based remote procedure calls or SOAP for exchanging messages.

Regarding Dependent claim 7, with dependency of claim 1, Joshi teaches the use of identity information from an identity profile in a system that provides data to resources on a network. Further Joshi indicates that the system uses XML language instructions in a remote procedure call. The XML data is the instruction form and is associated with the identity profile (column 2, lines 45-67 & column 48, lines 18-21). Although Joshi mentions the use of remote procedure calls and user authorization he fails to describe the actual execution of the instruction form. Layman discloses wherein the outputted information on the retrieved instruction form includes information to identify the instruction form (abstract, fig 2 &3, & column 5, lines 20-60). At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to output the instructions on the form to an execution apparatus on the network. The motivation being that Joshi indicates that the invention uses remote procedure calls using XML but not in detail whereas Layman describes in detail the execution of instructions to an apparatus on the network using XML based remote procedure calls or SOAP for exchanging messages.

Regarding Dependent claim 8, with dependency of claim 1, Joshi teaches the use of identity information from an identity profile in a system that provides data to resources on a network. Further Joshi indicates that the system uses XML language instructions in a remote procedure call. The XML data is the instruction form and is associated with the

identity profile (column 2, lines 45-67 & column 48, lines 18-21). Although Joshi mentions the use of remote procedure calls and user authorization he fails to describe the actual execution of the instruction form. Layman discloses Wherein user authentication is performed using the information on the user (abstract, fig 2 &3, & column 5, lines 20-60). At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to output the instructions on the form to an execution apparatus on the network. The motivation being that Joshi indicates that the invention uses remote procedure calls using XML but not in detail whereas Layman describes in detail the execution of instructions to an apparatus on the network using XML based remote procedure calls or SOAP for exchanging messages.

Regarding Dependent claim 9, with dependency of claim 1, Joshi teaches the use of identity information from an identity profile in a system that provides data to resources on a network. Further Joshi indicates that the system uses XML language instructions in a remote procedure call. The XML data is the instruction form and is associated with the identity profile (column 2, lines 45-67 & column 48, lines 18-21). Although Joshi mentions the use of remote procedure calls and user authorization he fails to describe the actual execution of the instruction form. Layman discloses a display information generation part that generates information to display the information on the retrieved instruction form (abstract, fig 2 &3, & column 5, lines 20-60). At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to output the instructions on the form to an execution apparatus on the network. The motivation being that Joshi indicates that the invention uses remote procedure calls using XML but not in detail whereas Layman describes in detail the execution of instructions to an apparatus on the network using XML based remote procedure calls or SOAP for exchanging messages.

Regarding Independent claims 11 and 12, Joshi teaches An instruction form execution apparatus comprising: An attachment part that attaches a storage medium, which is unique to a predetermined user, holding information on a plurality of instruction form management apparatuses holding instruction form accessible to the user (column 2, lines 45-67 & column 48, lines 18-21, Joshi teaches the use of identity information from an identity profile in a system that provides data to resources on a network. Further Joshi indicates that the system uses XML language instructions in a remote procedure call. The XML data is the instruction form and is associated with the identity profile); Although Joshi mentions the use of remote procedure calls and user authorization he fails to describe the actual execution of the instruction form. Layman discloses An input part that inputs the instruction form accessible to the user from two or more of the instruction form management apparatuses, based on the information on the instruction form management

apparatus (abstract, fig 2 &3, & column 5, lines 20-60, wherein the instruction form is the XML message that includes instructions to be performed by another computer on the network using a remote procedure call); An execution part that executes a plurality processing instructions indicated in the input instruction form (abstract, fig 2 &3, & column 5, lines 20-60, wherein the instruction form includes plurality of instructions and is the XML message that includes instructions to be performed by another computer on the network using a remote procedure call). At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to output the instructions on the form to an execution apparatus on the network. The motivation being that Joshi indicates that the invention uses remote procedure calls using XML but not in detail whereas Layman describes in detail the execution of instructions to an apparatus on the network using XML based remote procedure calls or SOAP for exchanging messages.

Regarding Dependent claim 14, with dependency of claim 13, Joshi teaches the use of identity information from an identity profile in a system that provides data to resources on a network. Further Joshi indicates that the system uses XML language instructions in a remote procedure call. The XML data is the instruction form and is associated with the identity profile (column 2, lines 45-67 & column 48, lines 18-21). Although Joshi mentions the use of remote procedure calls and user authorization he fails to describe the actual execution of the instruction form. Layman discloses wherein the information on the retrieved instruction form is outputted to the instruction form execution apparatus used by the user (abstract, fig 2 &3, & column 5, lines 20-60). At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to output the instructions on the form to an execution apparatus on the network. The motivation being that Joshi indicates that the invention uses remote procedure calls using XML but not in detail whereas Layman describes in detail the execution of instructions to an apparatus on the network using XML based remote procedure calls or SOAP for exchanging messages.

Regarding Dependent claim 15, with dependency of claim 13, Joshi teaches the use of identity information from an identity profile in a system that provides data to resources on a network. Further Joshi indicates that the system uses XML language instructions in a remote procedure call. The XML data is the instruction form and is associated with the identity profile (column 2, lines 45-67 & column 48, lines 18-21). Although Joshi mentions the use of remote procedure calls and user authorization he fails to describe the actual execution of the instruction form. Layman discloses outputting a command to the instruction form management apparatus to transmit the instruction form accessible to the user to the instruction form execution apparatus used by the user, based on the information on the retrieved instruction form (abstract, fig 2 &3, & column 5, lines 20-60). At the time of the invention it would have been

obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to output the instructions on the form to an execution apparatus on the network. The motivation being that Joshi indicates that the invention uses remote procedure calls using XML but not in detail whereas Layman describes in detail the execution of instructions to an apparatus on the network using XML based remote procedure calls or SOAP for exchanging messages.

Regarding Independent claim 17, Joshi teaches the use of identity information from an identity profile in a system that provides data to resources on a network. Further Joshi indicates that the system uses XML language instructions in a remote procedure call. The XML data is the instruction form and is associated with the identity profile (column 2, lines 45-67 & column 48, lines 18-21). Although Joshi mentions the use of remote procedure calls and user authorization he fails to describe the actual execution of the instruction form. Layman discloses an instruction form execution apparatus comprising: An attachment part that attaches a storage medium that stores an instruction form that includes processing instructions accessible to a user (abstract, fig 2 &3, & column 5, lines 20-60, wherein the instruction form is the XML message that includes instructions to be performed by another computer on the network using a remote procedure call); A processing part that executes the processing instructions based on the instruction form to process information not stored in the storage medium (abstract, fig 2 &3, & column 5, lines 20-60, wherein the instruction form is the XML message and includes a processing component for processing the instructions in the message). At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to output the instructions on the form to an execution apparatus on the network. The motivation being that Joshi indicates that the invention uses remote procedure calls using XML but not in detail whereas Layman describes in detail the execution of instructions to an apparatus on the network using XML based remote procedure calls or SOAP for exchanging messages.

It is noted that any citation [[s]] to specific, pages, columns, lines, or figures in the prior art references and any interpretation of the references should not be considered to be limiting in any way. A reference is relevant for all it contains and may be relied upon for all that it would have reasonably suggested to one having ordinary skill in the art.
[[See, MPEP 2123]]

Response to Arguments

7. Applicant's arguments filed October 30, 2006 have been fully considered but are moot in view of the new ground of rejection.

Conclusion

References cited

8. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

- Johnson et al. (U.S. Pub 2002/0161934) discloses "System And Method For Communication Of Data Between A Host And An Administration System"
- Smith et al. (U.S. 6,973,659) discloses "Mapping Between Remote Procedure Call System Primitives And Event Driven Execution Environment System Primitives"
- Merrick et al. (U.S. 7,028,312) discloses "XML Remote Procedure Call (XML-RPC)"
- Costa-Requena et al. (U.S. Pub 2004/0139198) discloses "Method And Apparatus For Manipulating Data With Session Initiation Protocol"
- Pavilk et al. (U.S. Pub 2004/0225724) discloses "RPC Type SOAP Service Access Via Taglibs For Dynamic Web Content"
- Dean et al. (U.S. Pub 2003/0061333) discloses "System And Method For Universal Networked Device Management"
- Satavolu et al. (U.S. Pub 2003/0191964) discloses "Method For Verifying The Identity Of A User For Session Authentication Purposes During Web Navigation"
- Nishio et al. (U.S. Pub 2006/0053124) discloses "Information Processing Apparatus, Information Processing Method, Program, And Storage Medium"

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Manglesh M. Patel whose telephone number is (571) 272-5937. The examiner can normally be reached on M, W 6 am-3 pm T, TH 6 am-2pm, Fr 9am-6pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Stephen S. Hong can be reached on (571) 272-4124. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Manglesh M. Patel
Patent Examiner
January 20, 2007



CESAR PAULA
PRIMARY EXAMINER